



April 2, 2002

William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: CC Docket No. 98-147. Reply Comments Regarding Verizon's Request that the Commission Clarify its Rules Concerning Collocation.

Dear Mr. Caton:

By this letter, WorldCom responds to comments filed by several parties on March 25, 2002 regarding Verizon Communication, Inc.'s request that the Federal Communications Commission clarify its collocation rules to require collocators to terminate their facilities on a Point of Termination bay ("POT bay"). In its initial comments, WorldCom asked the Commission to reject Verizon's request because it is inconsistent with the Commission's rules. Similar to Sprint Corporation, WorldCom explained that the option to use a POT bay lies with the collocating carrier.

Verizon stands by its position that it can require the use of a POT bay under the Commission's Rules. Conversely, AT&T, Sprint and ASCENT join WorldCom and disagree, citing the Commission's rule that specifically states that an ILEC may not require competitors to use intermediate interconnection arrangements.¹ As ASCENT points out, Verizon's own CLEC handbook states that a POT bay is "an intermediate distributing frame."² Despite Verizon's own documentation, it now asks the Commission to construe a POT bay as a "direct connection" to its network.³

Even more troubling is Verizon's mischaracterization of a New York Public Service Commission order that addresses the use of POT bays. Verizon states that New York approved the requirement of POT bays and rejected arguments that POT bays are intermediate points of interconnection.⁴ What Verizon fails to note is that the New York Commission specifically limited the use of POT bays to SCOPE (Secured Collocation Open Physical Environment) arrangements. In fact, the New York Commission stated that if a CLEC did not want to use a

¹ 47 C.F. R. § 51.323 (k) (2).

² Letter from Charles C. Hunter, General Counsel of Association of Communications Enterprises, to Michelle M. Carey, Chief, Competition Policy Division, CC Docket No. 98-147, dated March 25, 2002, at p. 2.

³ Comments of Verizon, CC Docket No. 98-147, dated March 25, 2002, at p. 1.

⁴ Verizon Comments at p. 4.

POT bay, it could “choose a cageless or physical collocation arrangement.”⁵ Clearly, Verizon mischaracterized New York’s limited approval of POT bays.

Moreover, Qwest’s comments underscore the need for the Commission to deny Verizon’s request. Specifically, Qwest points out that Verizon’s clarification request addresses not only ILEC to CLEC connections but also connections between two competitive carriers (i.e., CLEC to CLEC interconnections).⁶ As Qwest points out, there is nothing in the Commission’s rules to suggest that such a practice of requiring the use of POT bays is permissible.

Verizon has not met its burden of proof to demonstrate why the Commission’s rules should be changed. Verizon provides no compelling basis why it should be allowed to require the use of POT bays and has not shown any technical reason why POT bays must be employed. As a result, the Commission should clarify that the ILEC practice of requiring the use of POT bays is inconsistent with its rules.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly Scardino
Dennis Guard
WorldCom, Inc.
1133 Nineteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 736-6478

Enclosure

⁵ Order Directing Tariff Revisions, New York Public Service Commission, Case No. 99-C-0715 and 95-C-0657 (August 31, 1999) at p. 13, attached hereto.

⁶ Comments of Qwest Services Corporation, CC Docket No. 98-147, dated March 25, 2002.

Certificate of Service

I, Lonzena Rogers, do hereby certify, that on this second day of April 2002, I have filed electronically with the Secretary's Office, WorldCom, Inc.'s Reply Comments in the matter of CC Docket No. 98-147 and additional copies to be delivered by United States Postal Service first class mail, hand delivery, and facsimile a true and correct copy of on the following:

William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, SW
Room TW-B204
Washington, DC 20554

Dorothy Attwood +
Chief
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Carol E. Matthey +
Deputy Chief
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Janice Myles +
Policy and Program Planning Division
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 Twelfth Street, SW
Room 5-C327
Washington, DC 20554

W. Scott Randolph
Director, Regulatory Affairs
Verizon Communications
1300 I Street, NW
Suite 500E
Washington, DC 20005

Joseph DiBella

Verizon Communications
1515 North Court House Road
Suite 500
Arlington, VA 22201-2909

Norina Moy
Richard Juhnke
Jay Keithley
Sprint Corporation
401 Ninth Street, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20004

Kathryn Marie Krause
Sharon Devine
QWEST Services Corporation
1020 Nineteenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Charles C. Hunter
General Counsel
Association of Communications Enterprises
Hunter Communications Law Group
11424 Sixteenth Street, NW
Suite 105
Washington, DC 20006

Stephen C. Garavito
Mark C. Rosenblum
AT&T Corporation
295 North Maple Avenue
Room 1131M1
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920

Qualex International +
FCC Reference Information Center

Portals II
445 Twelfth Street, SW
Room CY-B402
Washington, DC 20554

_____/s/_____
Lonzena Rogers

* Denotes Hand Delivery
+ Denotes Facsimile